

*REMARKS*

The specification and claims have been carefully reviewed in the light of the Office Action to which the amendment is responsive. Applicant's attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for the courteous telephone conversation during which time the foregoing amendments to claims 1 and 13 were discussed.

As indicated during the telephone conversation, claim 1 has been amended to clarify the claimed subject matter as relating to window shades "for motor vehicles", as was believed to be implicit from the claim in its original form and covered by the Examiner's search. Hence, the claim is not believed to introduce new matter which would require further searching.

Claims 1-19 have been rejected as being obvious over Schlecht et al. '375 in view of Lichy, and reconsideration of such rejection is respectfully requested. As further indicated during the telephone discussion, Lichy is believed to be neither analogous to the subject matter of the present invention, nor provide any disclosure or suggestion of applicant's invention as claimed.

At the outset, Lichy, which is directed to a garage door closure arrangement, neither concerns the field of automobile window shades, nor deals with the problems of providing reliable and stable support moveable window shades during movement of the automobile. Lichy concerns an entirely different problem of providing a seal for a door closure web. Lichy provides no suggestion of utilizing an elastic lip that is mounted in contacting elastically deformed relation to a pull rod of a curtain for biasing and maintaining the pull rod into continuous rattle-free contact with a guide rail within which the pull rod is moveable. Lichy has a bottom bar 22 that extends between lateral guide rails, but its ends do not engage guide rails. Small gaps remain between the ends of the bottom bar and the facing edges of the rails. The brushes in Lichy contact the curtain, not the bars, and are for sealing purposes, not for biasing the bars into rattle-free contact with guide rails. Indeed, similar brush sets are provided along the upper edge of the doorway opening. Lichy simply would provide no impetus for using a brush or lip to contact and bias a pull rod of a curtain into contacting rattle-free engagement with a side of its guide rail. Hence, it can be seen that Lichy is neither analogous to the art of the present invention, nor provides any teachings which would lead a person skilled in the art to modify Schlecht et al. in a manner as called for in claim 1. Obviousness of course cannot be derived from a hindsight reading of the references.

The dependent claims are directed to more various more specific features of the invention, also lacking in the prior art. By way of example, as specifically discussed during the telephone conversation with the Examiner, claim 13 calls for the elastic lip to be configured to cover the guide rail slit, while allowing movement of the pull rod along the guide rail. The feature also is clearly lacking in the prior art.

From the foregoing, it is believed that the claims as now presented all are directed to features which are neither disclosed nor claimed so as to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, an early action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Dennis R. Schlemmer, Reg. No. 24,703  
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.  
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900  
180 North Stetson Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780  
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)  
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: February 3, 2005

Amendment or ROA - Regular (Revised 7/29/03)